



Seat Management Workgroup Minutes

Department of Information Technology
3rd Floor Executive Conference Room

(Richmond Plaza Building, 7th Street entrance, Richmond)

April 23, 2001

2:00 pm

Attendance

5 Members Present:

Joshua Heslinga (College of W&M); Ken Mittendorff (SC); Naseem Reza (VSP); Wayne Stafford (DOC); George Williams (UVA)

7 Presenters, Guests, Staff and Representatives Present:

Curt Diemer (eGov-SMS); John Hagerty (Compaq); David Romancik (Unisys); John Panko (Halifax); Constance Scott (eGov — SMS); John Tabler (ACS); Chuck Tyger (eGov-SMS)

6 Members Absent:

Laverne Branch (DGS); Ed Ernouf (PDC); Steve Kelliher (VDOT); Keith Segerson (GMU) Pete Stamps (Lottery); Rick Wilhelm (Fairfax County)

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Wayne Stafford, Chairman of the Seat Management Workgroup, convened the meeting at 2:03 p.m.

Meeting Objectives

Discuss outstanding issues regarding Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) studies and the Seat Management state contracts.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the 3-26-2001 meeting were approved and will be placed on the COTS website.

Status of Three Previous action items

1. Seat Management change control procedure was forwarded to the COTS Executive Director for feedback.
2. The requests for contract changes workgroup report/letter was forwarded to the COTS Executive Director for feedback.
3. The workgroup members studied the minimum TCO Metrics worksheets and were prepared to discuss and act on the recommendations of the workgroup.

TCO Minimum metrics

Discussion

Chuck Tyger (eGov-SMS) led the discussion regarding the TCO minimum metrics recommendations. After adding "IT Staff" to the document by consent, the motion to forward the TCO minimum metrics recommendation to the full COTS Committed passed unanimously. Mr. Tyger then distributed the Model for Doing TCO Studies for Small Agencies and a current copy of the TCO status report

Action Items

1. The Chairman will email final versions of the TCO minimum metrics recommendations to all committee members. (Attachment 1-Ammended Version)
2. The Chairman will forward the final version to the full COTS committee for consideration.
3. TCO Contract links will be added to the www.seatmanagement.state.va.us website.

SEAT MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS

Discussion

Constance Scott (eGov-SMS) led a general discussion regarding the Seat Management Contracts change control procedures and proposed changes. She conveyed the COTS Executive Director's desire to streamline the proposed contract change process to make contract changes easier.

Jeff Davis (DIT-ASD) has written up a contract change to allow additional brand families and additional

catalog services. These should be available for review by the Workgroup in 5 to 10 days. They will then be presented to the SMART vendors. All three vendors must agree upon them. If added, the brand families could grow to 6 brands per SMART Vendor. Network services and software services will be added. Handhelds are being discussed but clarification is needed regarding this. Ms. Scott suggested that additional service level metrics should be considered and possibly be used to tie hardware specification to a third party service such as Zif Davis. Point of Sale was discussed again but the consensus remains that this is not a priority for very many agencies and would be a major deviation from the stated purpose of the current contracts. Clarification is still needed regarding contract administration roles, implementation planning and termination planning.

The Department of Planning and Budget has been approached about adding SMART services as a line item and the issue of funding still remains the main barrier to fuller implementation of Seat Management.

DIT has signed a SMART Contract with ACS.

The Seat Management Section is evaluating the possibility of taking on the role of a program office, to include contract administration duties.

Action Items

1. Continue to evaluate current contract change process and identify opportunities to streamline.
2. Continue to evaluate contract changes and identify priority changes that will help bring about additional SMART implementation.
3. Workgroup Members will receive the proposed changes to the SMART contracts as soon as they are available. Ms. Scott will clarify the contract issue with a bullet sheet regarding handhelds and the RFQ process after discussing this with Jeff Davis.

Discussion

The Chairman summarized the new action items and made closing remarks.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Next Meeting

May 21st, 2:00 — 3:30 at DIT

Respectfully Submitted,
Curt Diemer
Electronic Government Implementation Division

Seat Management Section

Attachment 1

Recommendation of the TCO Metrics Subgroup

Presented to the Seat Management Workgroup

March 26, 2001

Revised April 23, 2001

Charge

The subgroup (Steve Kelliher, Chuck Tyger, George Williams) was charged with identifying key TCO metrics that should be provided to the Seat Management Section office.

Recommendation

Based on discussions with the TCO vendors and experience with TCO studies conducted by the Seat Management Section, the subgroup recommends that, at a minimum, the metrics listed in Table 1 and the Best Practices Implementation Status outlined in Table 2 be captured and reported by agencies and institutions of higher education.

Specifically, the subgroup identified three approaches to conducting a TCO study:

1. TCO studies based on the Gartner methodology

Studies conducted by the TCO vendors and the Seat Management Section employ the Gartner methodology. Agencies and institutions can acquire the software and training to conduct studies using the Gartner methodology. These studies should provide the metrics and Best Practices Implementation Status noted in the tables.

2. TCO studies based on a Gartner-compatible methodology

Agencies and institutions that have conducted a TCO study based on an industry recognized Gartner-compatible methodology should identify the methodology and provide at least Asset information (metrics A.1 — A.5),

end user count (B.1), IT staff count (B.3), and direct hardware and software costs (C.1.a). In addition, the Best Practices Implementation Status should be completed.

3. TCO studies based on internally developed methodologies

Agencies and institutions that have conducted a TCO study based on an internally developed methodology should provide a description of the methodology and data collection process. Based on the study, at least Asset information (metrics A.1 — A.5), end user count (B.1), IT staff count (B.3), and direct hardware and software costs (C.1.a) should be provided. In addition, the Best Practices Implementation Status should be completed.

For the second and third approaches, the Seat Management Section will work with the agency or institution to complete the TCO Best Practices Implementation Status table.

Table 1 — TCO Baseline Metrics

A. Assets

1. Current number of servers
2. Current number of client desktops
3. Current number of client mobile computers
4. Current number of peripherals
5. Current number of network devices

B. Staff Data

1. Number of end users counted in the evaluation
2. End user average unburdened salary used in the evaluation
3. Number of IT staff allocated to supporting and maintaining the

distributed computing environment in the evaluation

C. Actual Cost Data

1. Direct Costs

a. Hardware and software

b. Operations

c. Administration

2. Indirect Costs

a. End User Operations

b. Downtime

Table 2 — TCO Best Practices Implementation Status

| Best Practices | Typical Scope | Typical Level |
|----------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Technology Improvements - Asset Management | | |
| Automated Asset Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Software Inventory | 0-100% | ** |
| Hardware Inventory | 0-100% | ** |
| Automated Software Distribution | 0-100% | ** |
| Technology Improvements - Systems Management | | |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|----|
| Virus Detection and Repair | 0-100% | ** |
| Systems Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Server Based Client Image Control | 0-100% | ** |
| User State Management and Restore | 0-100% | ** |
| Technology Improvements - Managed PC | | |
| Unattended Power Up | 0-100% | ** |
| Client Hardware Event Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Low Impact Upgradeability | 0-100% | ** |
| Technology Improvements - Scalability | | |
| Scalable Architecture | 0-100% | ** |
| Low Risk, High Quality Vendor/Provider Selection | 0-100% | ** |
| Technology Improvements - Business Protection | | |
| Fault Tolerance | 0-100% | ** |
| Automated Backup and Restore | 0-100% | ** |
| Hardware Physical Security Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Technology Improvements - Service Desk | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|----|
| Service Desk Problem Management and Resolution | 0-100% | ** |
| Client Remote Control | 0-100% | ** |
| Process Improvements - User Management | | |
| Enterprise Policy Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Locked User Environment | 0-100% | ** |
| Data Security Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Change Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Process Improvements - Standardization | | |
| Vendor Standardization | 0-100% | ** |
| Platform Standardization | 0-100% | ** |
| Application Standardization | 0-100% | ** |
| Centralized and Optimized Procurement | 0-100% | ** |
| Process Improvements - Practice Management | | |
| More Time Spent Planning Versus Implementing | 0-100% | ** |
| Service Level Tracking and Management | 0-100% | ** |
| Capacity Planning | 0-100% | ** |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------|----|
| TCO Lifecycle Management | 0-100% | ** |
| People Improvements | | |
| User Training | 0-100% | ** |
| IS Training | 0-100% | ** |
| IS Staff Highly Motivated | 0-100% | ** |
| Stable IS Organization | 0-100% | ** |

**** Basic, Medium, or Advanced (See TCO Draft Guidelines)**